Application No. 10/764,456 Reply to Office Action of September 14, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-24 are pending. Claims 20-24 are withdrawn. Claim 1 is amended and Claims 2 and 6 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; Claims 1 and 7-19 were rejected as anticipated by <u>Takebayashi</u> (Japanese Patent Publication No. 2002110547); and Claims 1-19 were rejected as unpatentable over <u>Takebayashi</u> in view of <u>Harada</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,783,863, hereinafter "<u>Harada '863</u>") or <u>Harada</u> (International Patent Application Publication No. WO 01/42526, hereinafter "<u>Harada</u> '<u>526</u>").

Initially, applicants and applicants' representative thank Primary Examiner Zimmerman for the interview held on October 25, 2006 to discuss the present case. During the interview, differences between the claimed invention and the cited references were discussed in detail, as well as proposed amendments to overcome the rejections of record. Examiner Zimmerman agreed to reconsider the rejections of record after formal submission of the present amendment.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Claim 1 is amended to recite "said plasma resistant coating comprises at least one of Al_2O_3 , Y_2O_3 , Sc_2O_3 , Sc_2F_3 , La_2O_3 , CeO_2 , Eu_2O_3 , or DyO_3 ." Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-19 are in compliance with all requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 1 as anticipated by <u>Takebayashi</u>, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

6

Application No. 10/764,456 Reply to Office Action of September 14, 2006

Amended Claim 1 recites in part, "a plasma resistant coating over only the head of the fastener, said plasma resistant coating comprises at least one of Al_2O_3 , Y_2O_3 , Sc_2O_3 , Sc_2F_3 , La_2O_3 , CeO_2 , Eu_2O_3 , or DyO_3 ."

<u>Takebayashi</u> describes a fastener with a plasma resistant film 8 on a bolt head 7a *and* a screw neck 7b.¹ Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion in <u>Takebayashi</u> for "a plasma resistant coating over *only the head of the fastener*" as recited in amended Claim 1. By including the film 8 on the screw neck 7b, <u>Takebayashi</u> uses excess film material and requires careful control of the thickness of film 8 to ensure smooth insertion of screw neck 7b into through hole 6. The invention recited in Claim 1 *only* includes the plasma resistant coating over the head of the fastener, and thus requires less of the coating material and avoids interference of the coating with connections made by the fastener.

Further, as conceded by the outstanding Office Action with respect to original Claims 2 and 6, <u>Takebayashi</u> does not teach "said plasma resistant coating comprises at least one of Al₂O₃, Y₂O₃, Sc₂O₃, Sc₂F₃, La₂O₃, CeO₂, Eu₂O₃, or DyO₃."

Consequently, <u>Takebayashi</u> does not teach "a plasma resistant coating over *only* the head of the fastener, *said plasma resistant coating comprises at least one of Al*₂O₃, Y_2O_3 , Sc_2O_3 , Sc_2F_3 , La_2O_3 , CeO_2 , Eu_2O_3 , or DyO_3 ," it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1 (and Claims 3-5 and 7-19 dependent therefrom) is patentable over <u>Takebayashi</u>.

Further, with regard to the rejection of Claims 1-19 as unpatentable over <u>Takebayashi</u> in view of <u>Harada '863</u> or <u>Harada '526</u>, it is respectfully submitted that neither <u>Harada '863</u> nor <u>Harada '526</u> teaches or suggests "a plasma resistant coating over *only* the head of the fastener" as recited in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-19 are patentable over <u>Takebayashi</u> in view of <u>Harada '863</u> or <u>Harada '526</u>.

¹See <u>Takebayashi</u>, paragraph 19 and Figure 1.

Application No. 10/764,456 Reply to Office Action of September 14, 2006

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-19 patentably distinguishes over the cited art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

Ş

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04)

22850

I:\atty\et\247394US\247394US-AMD12.14.06.DOC

Educated Tracy Steven P. Weihrouch Attorney of Record Registration No. 32,829

Edward Tracy Registration No. 47,998